

REMARKS

Below, the applicant's comments are preceded by related remarks of the examiner set forth in small bold type.

2. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 recites "a source domain" and "a destination clock," which are also recited in claim 3 on which claim 4 depends. Thus, it is not clearly whether "a source domain" and "a destination clock" in claim 4 are different from those in claim 3. And yet, in light of the context of the claim, it appears that applicant meant "a source domain" and "a destination clock" in claim 4 refer back to those in claim 3, and will be treated as such for the purpose of examination. Correction or confirmation is required.

Claim 4 has been amended.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bruculerie et al (US 5,036,221).

Consider claims 1 and 18. Referring to Fig. 5, Bruculerie et al discloses a circuit for eliminating metastability, comprising;

"a domain-synchronizing controller" (68) which produces "a source enable signal" based on a synchronous pulse signal (SYSTEM CLOCK), the enable signal enabling a source register (36) to capture data (DATA) from a source domain, see col. 5, lines 44-58, and "a source-enable controller" (42) which produces "a source inhibit signal" for controlling the production of the source enable signal. See the signal output from NOR gate (126) inhibits the production of the enabling signal, which is the output from the domain-synchronizing controller (68) from clocking the register (48). Specifically, the controller disables the buffer (110) such that the "source enable signal" is not conducted to the register. See col. 5, lines 36-40.

Regarding claim 2, the NOR gate produces the inhibit/disable signal until the data is available to the source register (48). See col. 6, lines 53-57.

5. Claims 3-12, 19-23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Claims 13-17, 24 and 25 are allowed.

The applicant thanks the examiner for allowing claims 13-17, 24, and 25, and indicating allowance of claims 3-12 and 19-23 if rewritten in independent form.

Without conceding the examiner's position, the applicant has amended the claims.

Amended claim 1 now includes the limitations of original claims 1 and 3. The applicant used the broader word "relationship" in the amended claim 1 instead of the word "ratio" in the original claim 3. The limitation "a source-enable controller to produce a source inhibit signal based on a relationship between a source domain clock and a destination domain clock" is not disclosed or suggested by the cited reference, so the applicant took the liberty to amend claim 1 in its present form.

Amended claim 18 includes the limitations of original claims 18 and 19. Similar to amended claim 1, the applicant took the liberty to use the broader word "relationship" in the amended claim 18 instead of the word "ratio" in the original claim 19.

New independent claim 26 includes the limitations of original claims 1 and 6. New independent claim 31 includes the limitations of original claims 1 and 7. New independent claim 35 includes the limitations of original claims 18 and 20. New independent claim 38 includes the limitations of original claims 18 and 21. New independent claim 40 includes the limitations of original claims 18 and 22.

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the claims on which they depend.

Cancelled and amended claims have been cancelled and amended, respectively, without prejudice. The applicant reserves the right to pursue those claims in a continuing application.

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Enclosed is a \$1250.00 check for excess claim fees and a \$450.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing attorney docket 10559-390001.

Applicant : Richard P. Mackey et al.
Serial No. : 09/872,277
Filed : May 31, 2001
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney Docket: 10559-390001 / P10253

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 3/29/2005

Rex Huang
Rex Huang* for
David L. Feigenbaum, Reg. No. 30,378

PTO Customer No. 26161
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

** See attached document certifying that Rex Huang has limited recognition to practice before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office under 37 CFR § 10.9(b).*

20978424.doc